



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

that the defendants wrongfully and injuriously made, on their own land, an embankment so heavy that the downward pressure (two hundred thousand tons), causing an equal lateral pressure, forced earth and gravel, lying below the surface in the defendant's land, into the plaintiff's land, thereby disturbing the surface of the plaintiff's lot, moving his house on to land not his, and cracking its foundation. The defendants justify under their charter, the embankment being properly and carefully built. The court holds that while the charter justifies any public damage from reasonable working of the road, as injury arising from noise, smoke, cinders, vibration, any damage which in its nature is distinctly private is not within their privilege. This decision, that such an embankment is not within the legislative sanction, which on the facts stated seems open to doubt, leaves the question as though the act had been done by a private individual, and the result of the case is that no man shall squeeze his neighbor's land, even below the surface. To say that a man cannot put buildings of the size he chooses on his own land is at first a startling doctrine; but if the plaintiff can prove actual transfer of particles of earth from his neighbor's lot to his, however far below the surface, it seems to follow necessarily that there is a trespass. Of course, as every downward pressure produces lateral pressure, and pressure is displacement, a man trespasses with every step he takes on his own land. It also follows, that, since the right to support extends only to the land itself, a man is absolutely responsible for all damages to his neighbor's land resulting from building on his own, however firm his land and however loose that of his neighbor. It is needless to add that the unmetaphysical sympathies of juries, as well as the infrequency of violent subterranean displacements, will keep this scientific principle within due limits.

---

AN OLD LAW FOR THE PROTECTION OF STUDENTS.—Economical students in our vicinity have doubtless been rejoicing over the discovery of a law by which they may at times enjoy the substantial of life at no pecuniary sacrifice. An old Massachusetts Statute, which has practically been unenforced since its enactment, reads that no innholder, tavern-keeper, retailer, confectioner, or keeper of a shop or house for the sale of drink or food, or a livery-stable keeper for horse or carriage hire, shall give credit to a student in an incorporated academy or other educational institution within the State; and in another section, that any one giving credit contrary to this provision shall forfeit a sum equal to twice the amount credited, whether the bill is paid or not. A Harvard student was recently forced, in order to dissolve an attachment for such a debt, to pay the bill. He therefore sued for money paid under duress, and recovered. The case was appealed to the Superior Court, but has since been compromised. Of course the Statute, though absurdly out of date, is not so absolutely inapplicable to the state of society now that, like the Blue Laws, it can be judicially disregarded. It is no more than foolish, and if the Legislature does not take the trouble to repeal it, occasional students will continue to grow slightly fatter from the existence of surroundings that make it impracticable for dealers to refuse all dealings on credit with protected Harvard innocents. It seems on the facts that the appellant had no case, as, if a debt due in honor but not in law is paid under compulsion of law, it is recoverable.